United Nations A/59/580–S/2004/926

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
26 November 2004

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-ninth session
Agenda item 29
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Fifty-ninth year

Letter dated 24 November 2004 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 24 November 2004, addressed to you by Reşat Çağlar, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 29, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Aitay **Cengizer**
Deputy Permanent Representative
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

04-62499 (E) 291104

Annex to the letter dated 24 November 2004 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon instructions from my Government, I have the honour to refer to the allegations of the Greek Cypriot representative in New York contained in his statement made to the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) at the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly on 27 October 2004, on the agenda item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects", and to convey to you our views on the matter.

More than six months have elapsed since the separate simultaneous referendums held in Cyprus on your settlement plan on 24 April 2004, in which the Greek Cypriot side resoundingly voted against settlement and sharing the benefits of European Union membership with Turkish Cypriots, who, on the other hand, overwhelmingly voted for compromise and a common future with the Greek Cypriots in the European Union. As you clearly underlined in your subsequent report on your mission of good offices submitted to the Security Council, dated 28 May 2004, "What was rejected [by the Greek Cypriots] was the solution itself rather than a mere blueprint" (S/2004/437, para. 83).

In paragraph 92 of the same report, you also concluded that "in the aftermath of the watershed vote of 24 April, I believe that a fundamental reassessment of the full range of United Nations peace activities in Cyprus is timely. The reassessment should include the four-decade-old search for peace in Cyprus, and consider how best to address the problem in the future. I accordingly intend to conduct a review, to be completed within three months, of UNFICYP's mandate, force levels and concept of operations, in the light of the developments on the ground, the positions of the parties, and any views of the Security Council might have."

Furthermore, on 22 October 2004, the Security Council, in its resolution 1568 (2004), endorsed your recommendations in this regard contained in your report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus (S/2004/756) and extended the mandate of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a further period of six months. Notwithstanding a 30 per cent reduction in the force level of UNFICYP and its amended concept of operations, the review has fallen short of updating the mandate of the Force in line with the drastically changed circumstances on the ground. We believe, however, that this issue can still be dealt with within the framework of the further review to be conducted prior to June 2006. The Greek Cypriot side should not be allowed to continue rejecting a settlement on the island while expecting everything else to remain constant.

I would like, once again, to underline that UNFICYP was deployed on the island in 1964 in the face of the Greek Cypriot atrocities against the Turkish Cypriot people and not as a result of the legitimate Turkish intervention of 1974. His devious attempt to draw a correlation between the existence and number of UNFICYP personnel on the island and that of the Turkish forces is insincere and hardly convincing. In this context, your assessment, which was also stated in the latest Security Council resolution on UNFICYP, that "the security situation on the island has become increasingly benign over the last few years and that a recurrence of fighting in Cyprus is increasingly unlikely" (resolution 1568 (2004), fifth

preambular paragraph), is an accurate assessment and is also supported by the Turkish Cypriot side. In view of this widely shared assessment of the prevailing conditions on the island, the deviously facile and contrived arguments of the Greek Cypriot representative seem all the more ridiculous.

Furthermore, the Greek Cypriot representative also endeavours to arrogate responsibilities to UNFICYP (i.e., a role in finding a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue) which fall exclusively within the scope of your good-offices mission. The aim here is clearly to undermine the role of your mission of good offices vis-à-vis the efforts to find a settlement in Cyprus and in doing so to downplay the importance of the results of the referendums and the Greek Cypriot side's rejection of the settlement plan.

As for the Greek Cypriot representative's utterances pertaining to a political settlement in Cyprus, your statement in your report on your mission of good offices (S/2004/437, para. 86) that "if the Greek Cypriots are ready to share power and prosperity with the Turkish Cypriots in a federal structure based on political equality, this needs to be demonstrated, not just by words, but by action" needs no further elaboration. In a similar vein, in the summary of the same report you also stated that "if they [the Greek Cypriots] remain willing to resolve the Cyprus problem through a bicommunal, bizonal federation, this needs to be demonstrated. Lingering Greek Cypriot concerns about security and implementation of the plan need to be articulated with clarity and finality." To this date, this call has not been properly responded to by the Greek Cypriot leadership. The failure and the unwillingness of the Greek Cypriot side to do so clearly demonstrates that it is not, and has never been, interested in a mutually acceptable solution in Cyprus, despite continuously professing to the contrary.

The Greek Cypriot Administration, whose representative attempts to portray it as the champion of human rights in every forum, has, to say the least, a tainted human rights record. The human rights violations committed in Cyprus against the Turkish Cypriot people during the period from 1963 to 1974 were attested to by relevant United Nations documents. On 10 September 1964, the then Secretary-General reported, "the economic restrictions being imposed against the Turkish communities in Cyprus, which in some instances have been so severe as to amount to a veritable siege, indicated that the Government of Cyprus seeks to force a potential solution by economic pressure" (S/5950, para. 222). Then, on 12 December 1964, the Secretary-General further stated, "in the report of 10 December, it was indicated that as at 1 September, 232 Turkish Cypriots were mission, according to the list completed by the Turkish Cypriot Missing Persons Bureau. Since that date, UNFICYP was informed that 23 Turkish Cypriots have been accounted for and their names have been deleted from the list of missing persons. This leaves 209 Turkish Cypriots still missing. Efforts to trace those missing will be continued by ICRC and UNFICYP, but there seems to be little prospect of finding them alive" (S/6102, para. 93). Furthermore, in his memoirs entitled *The Past Has Another Pattern*, the then American Under-Secretary of State, George Ball, said that the central interest of the Greek Cypriot leader Makarios "was to block off Turkish intervention so that he and his Greek Cypriots could go on happily massacring Turkish Cypriots" (p. 64).

Notwithstanding their bitter past experience, the Greek Cypriot rejection of your settlement plan and the current blockage by the Greek Cypriot Administration

of the adoption by the European Council of the Commission's financial aid and direct trade regulations for Northern Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriot side, in stark contrast, continues with its positive attitude and most recently has opened a secondary school in Karpaz for the Greek Cypriot children living in the north and rid its textbooks of any malicious language towards Greek Cypriots. This conciliatory approach of the Turkish Cypriot side is all the more important given the fact that there is no school in the south providing education for Turkish Cypriot children in their mother tongue and that the Greek Cypriot textbooks are filled with hatred and hostility towards Turkish Cypriots.

(*Signed*) Reşat **Çağlar**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus